

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP
DECEMBER 15, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY
(2:00 - 3:45 p.m. via conference call)**

SIG members present: Carol Abella, Steve Campi, James Colston, Kevin Cooper, Karen Garrison, Joel Greenberg, Nancy Hastings, Ken Kurtis, Dr. James Liu, Jim Martin, Jesús Ruiz, Steve Scheiblauber

Others present: Phil Isenberg (chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force), Amy Boone (note taker; MLPA Initiative staff), John Kirlin (MLPA Initiative staff), Melissa Miller-Henson (MLPA Initiative staff), John Ugoretz (DFG staff)

Acronyms used: California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), marine protected area (MPA), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Project (CCP), MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRS), MLPA Lessons Learned Project (LLP), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT)

Welcome, Roll Call, and Logistics for Conference Call

The meeting began with a brief welcome by Phil Isenberg, chair of the MLPA BRTF. Chair Isenberg reminded participants to please mute their phones if in a noisy environment.

Update on Central Coast Process

John Kirlin provided a summary of the two CCRSG meetings in November (Cambria) and December (Monterey). At the December CCRSG, the number of internal packages was reduced to three through a process of straw voting. Final revisions to the remaining packages were due for submission at 8:00 a.m. today. The SAT evaluation sub-team will be meeting tomorrow (Friday, December 16, 2005) to work with MLPA Initiative staff on developing a work plan. Initiative staff expects to be able to post to the website the initial SAT sub-team evaluation of packages one week before the next SAT meeting, or by January 13, 2006. Staff expects to be able to post the final SAT evaluation as soon as possible after the SAT meeting January 20, 2005 and at least one week prior to the next BRTF meeting on January 31, 2006.

SIG member questions included how the SAT will evaluate the packages and how their criteria for evaluation relate to the MPF. John Kirlin clarified that the SAT will be asked to evaluate whether the packages meet the requirements of the MLPA and if not, why. The SAT will not rank the proposals. Lastly, all of the criteria used by the SAT will be based upon criteria set forth in the MPF; if not, the criteria will be forwarded to the BRTF.

A SIG member expressed concern about the lack of time between the SAT meeting on January 20 and the BRTF meeting on January 31-February 1 and hopes that the BRTF will allow flexibility for proposals to change based upon SAT guidance.

A SIG member asked that the BRTF be privileged to know differing opinions of the SAT members regarding the evaluation. John Kirlin stated that he intends to bring all information from the SAT forward to the BRTF, including any dissenting opinions.

A SIG member expressed concern that the presentation on initial package evaluations by Dr. Gaines, Dr. Carr, and Dr. Palumbi at the November BRTF meeting had not been discussed in SIG meetings previously. John Kirlin explained that the presentation on initial package evaluations was completed in a short timeframe of approximately three to four days so that package proponents would benefit from SAT feedback before the CCRSG meeting on December 9-10, 2005.

A SIG member expressed appreciation to the BRTF for allowing Richard Parrish to speak on the panel of package proponents at the last BRTF meeting. The same member also expressed appreciation to the BRTF for directing pointed questions to both the SAT members and package proponents.

Update on SAT Presentations

John Ugoretz referenced the science presentations that have been made to the BRTF and were attached to the SIG agenda as item #3. John Ugoretz reiterated that the SAT evaluation sub-team will be meeting on Friday, December 16, 2005. He also stated that a draft SAT evaluation will be available to the public at least one week before the BRTF meeting January 31-February 1, 2006.

A SIG member asked whether the SAT guidelines as stated in the MPF will be peer reviewed. John Ugoretz replied that Oregon Sea Grant is currently conducting the peer review and will have results by the first of the year.

A SIG member expressed concern over the SAT water quality presentation at the November BRTF meeting and believed that it was not as expansive as it could have been if the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) had been involved. Melissa Miller-Henson responded that, even though not present at the BRTF meeting, the SWRCB was invited to contribute to the presentation. The SIG member concluded by saying she will follow-up with a written statement to the BRTF.

November Task Force Meeting

John Kirlin presented an overview of the November 29-30, 2005 BRTF meeting in Monterey. The BRTF received two science presentations (one on MPA networks and one on water quality) in addition to the SAT initial evaluations of package proposals. Package proponents were able to make short presentations to the BRTF and received questions. There were two action items regarding design and implementation.

Tim Gage and Craig Brown, former directors of the California Department of Finance and consultants to the MLPA Initiative, presented their work on long-term financing for marine protected areas in California. The BRTF received the report and, with minor modifications, voted to forward the report to Secretary for Resources Mike Chrisman. Public comments on the long-term financing report (limited to strategic thinking, not editorial comments) are due by

January 6, 2006. The BRTF will then have a discussion at its next meeting about long-term financing and may decide to forward more strategic thinking to the secretary for resources.

A SIG member expressed concerns over the “rigs to reef” proposal in the long-term funding report. She will submit written comments regarding this issue to the BRTF.

A SIG member requested that package proponents be allowed more time to present their packages than what was allowed at the November BRTF meeting.

Lessons Learned Project

John Kirlin described the MLPA Lessons Learned Project (LLP) for which SIG members received a draft work plan as an attachment to the agenda for this meeting. The purpose of the LLP is to solicit feedback from participants in the CCP in order to improve the process for the next study region. Staff has been working on a draft request for statements of qualifications that will be sent to the SIG list server. John Kirlin encouraged SIG members to spread the word regarding the request and to recommend individuals or firms that might be interested in this type of work and that have relevant experience.

Chair Isenberg reiterated the importance of this project and stated that it is necessary to solicit feedback as soon as possible before participants forget or before their opinion of the process is modified by the results of the process. Chair Isenberg encouraged all SIG members to participate in the LLP.

A SIG member applauded this effort and had several recommendations of other similar reports.

A SIG member expressed concern over how participants will be selected to participate in the LLP. Chair Isenberg stated that there will be adequate time given for written comments from SIG members.

Several SIG members expressed their desire for participants to anonymously contribute to the LLP report. John Kirlin replied that this opportunity would be provided.

Open Discussion

Socioeconomic information

Several SIG members expressed concern over the use of the Ecotrust data and maps. One member expressed concern that the maps were not distributed to CCRSG members. John Kirlin replied that the Ecotrust maps presented at the November CCRSG meeting were not circulated to CCRSG members for purposes of confidentiality; the fishermen gave permission for the maps to be used in the meeting, but not to be distributed. He also stated that the data is housed on DFG computers and can be used by CCRSG members at the DFG offices. Another SIG member expressed concern that the Ecotrust methodology has not been peer reviewed.

John Kirlin responded that Ecotrust's methods are common social science methods and not anything out of the ordinary. In addition, Ecotrust will provide a full description of their methods.

Several SIG members expressed concern that socioeconomic impacts are not being adequately considered in this process. John Kirlin stated that the requirements of the MLPA are for stakeholder input into socioeconomic consideration. He went on to say that some comments from BRTF members may have implied a greater socioeconomic analysis than what is required by the law.

John Kirlin went on to state that the Ecotrust data, combine with DFG data, will be used for socioeconomic evaluation of the proposed packages. He also noted that there is intense interest in socioeconomic information and that this data is difficult and time-consuming to collect.

Inclusion of fisheries management

A SIG member reminded staff that the California Fisheries Coalition (CFC) has requested that a presentation regarding fisheries management be made at the next BRTF meeting. John Kirlin replied that fisheries management has been discussed at several BRTF meetings and expressed concern that, if CFC is allowed to make this presentation, other stakeholder groups will want to make presentations as well which will limit the time the BRTF has to do its work. Chair Isenberg stated that the role of the BRTF is to evaluate proposals and make recommendations and that fisheries management is not part of the statute of the MLPA. Several SIG members stated that they disagreed with John Kirlin and Chair Isenberg's interpretation of the act.

Next study region for MLPA implementation

A SIG member asked when the next study region for MLPA implementation will be chosen. John Kirlin answered that he has written an options memo for Secretary Mike Chrisman but that it is not within the role of the MLPA Initiative to make such a decision. Chair Isenberg followed by stating that the choice of the next study region will be influenced by future events, most notably the LLP.

Future Dates

Melissa Miller-Henson reminded members of relevant future dates, including:

- December 21, 2005: Comments due regarding the draft work plan for the lessons learned project.
- January 6, 2006: Comments due regarding the long-term financing of the MLPA (please limit comments to financing strategies, not editorial comments).
- January 20, 2006: SAT meeting (San Jose)
- January 31 - February 1, 2006: BRTF meeting (San Luis Obispo area)
- February ?, 2006: SIG conference call (approx 10 days after BRTF)

- March 2, 2006: SAT meeting (San Luis Obispo)
- March 14-15, 2006: BRTF meeting (Monterey area)
- March ?, 2006: SIG conference call (approx 10 days after BRTF)
- May 1, 2006: SAT meeting (San Jose)
- May ?, 2006: Joint BRTF / Fish and Game Commission meeting (Sacramento)